UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/739,044 | 12/18/2000 | Feza Buyukdura | 1999-0685 | 3059 |

24197 7590 05/21/2004

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP
121 SW SALMON STREET
SUITE 1600
PORTLAND, OR 97204

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| VUONG, QUOCHIEN B | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2685 | 11 |

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/739,044 | BUYUKDURA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Quochien B Vuong | 2685 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 February 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's response filed on 02/17/04. Claims 1-7 and 9-26 are now pending in the present application. **This action is made final.**

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-7, and 9-14, 16-19, 21-23, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rahrer et al. (US 6,005,927) in view of Sabnani et al. (US 6,393,296).

As to claims 1, 6-7, 12, 13, and 23, Rahrer et al. discloses a network which receives information from a sender 314 intended to be received by a receiving unit 316, converts the received information to another format which is recognizable by the receiving unit 316, transmits the converted information to the receiving unit 316 to be displayed thereat. Rahrer et al. thus discloses all the claimed limitations (see column 18 lines 5-36; see also figure 12) except determining whether the received information is in a format recognizable for correct display by a second device, wherein the determining is based at least in part on consideration of display characteristics of the second device; and selectively adjusting the received information based at least in part of the display characteristics of the second device. However, Sabnani et al. disclose determining whether the received information is in a format recognizable for correct display by a second device (display available or not), wherein the determining is based at least in part on consideration of display characteristics of the second device; and selectively adjusting the received information (text or speech) based at least in part of the display characteristics of the second device (column 2, lines 25-34; and figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the teaching of Sabnani et al. to the system and method of Rahrer to provide visible or audible information of the caller to the user.

As to claims 2-3, Rahrer discloses the claimed limitations (see memories 318, 320 in figure 12).

As to claim 4, Rahrer discloses a transceiver (included in numeral 308).

As to claims 5, 9-11, and 14, Rahrer discloses converting a telephone number from one format to another format (see column 18 lines 24-27).

As to claim 16, Sabnani et al. disclose wherein the adjusting is further based at least in part on device characteristics of the first device (column 2, lines 25-34).

As to claim 17, Rahrer discloses the computer system is a node of a telecommunications network (figure 12).

As to claims 18, 21, and 25 Sabnani et al. discloses the first and second device are mobile telephones (see figure 1).

As to claims 19, 22, and 26, Rahrer discloses the first device does not specify to the computer system any device characteristics of the second device (see column 18 lines 5-36).

4. Claims 15, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rahrer et al. in view of Sabnani et al. and further in view of Bierman et al. (US 5,761,279).

As to claims 15, 20, and 24, Rahrer and Sabnani et al. fail to disclose the information further comprises a name associated with the phone number. However, Bierman et al. disclose CLID including a name associated with a phone number (column 4, lines 31-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the teaching of Bierman et al. to the system and method of Rahrer and Sabnani et al. for providing more useful information about the caller to the user.

### *Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Box A.F.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Quochien B. Vuong whose telephone number is (703) 306-4530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. EST.

If attemps to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban, can be reached on (703) 305-4385.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

QUOCHIEN B. VUONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Quochien B. Vuong
May 14, 2004.